

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/027,087	12/20/2001	Gerald P. Coffey	26200-8-1	9686
21130	7590 03/22/2004		EXAM	INER
BENESCH, FRIEDLANDER, COPLAN & ARONOFF LLP ATTN: IP DEPARTMENT DOCKET CLERK			YOON, TAE H	
2300 BP TO		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
200 PUBLIC SQUARE CLEVELAND, OH 44114			1714	
			DATE MAILED: 03/22/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	1	10.00				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/027,087	COFFEY, GERALD P.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
,	Tae H Yoon	1714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror cause the application to become ABANDON	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	*				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicated any accomplicated any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the specific part of the specific pa	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So ion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	. ;	•				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion Noved in this National Stage				
*						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summar	v (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of References Cited (PTO-092) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail [

Application/Control Number: 10/027,087

Art Unit: 1714

The recited "such as" in claim 9 is objected and a separate claim reciting the recited species is suggested.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-33 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of copending Application No. 10/027,718 and claims 1-33 of copending Application No. 10/386,387. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the polymer coating and the emulsion polymer of said applications encompass the instant elastomer latex and the method of preparing colored rubber particles of said applications inherently encompasses the instant method of mixing and drying.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Application/Control Number: 10/027,087

Art Unit: 1714

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim recited "the mixture" lacks an antecedent basis (and it is unclear to which mixture of claim 1 is referred).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 13-19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jakubisin et al (US 5,543,172) or Greenberg et al (US 5,910,514) in view of Morrison (US 4,745,032), Miller et al (US 5,369,146) and further in view of JP 62131050.

Jakubisin et al teach a method of coloring rubber fragments from used rubber tires in abstract and at col. 2, lines 24-34. The method comprises mixing said rubber fragments with an aqueous polymeric coating composition with organic and inorganic pigments and various additives and drying thereof (col. 2, line 35 to col. 3, line 21).

Greenberg et al teach the same at col. 4, line 26 to col. 5, line 22.

Application/Control Number: 10/027,087

Art Unit: 1714

The instant invention further recites an elastomeric latex coating over Jakubisin et al and Greenberg et al. However, the use of an elastomeric latex coating over various substrates in order to protect said substrates is well known in the art as taught by Morrison (col. 5, line 28 to col. 6, line 30) and Miller et al (col. 3, lines 17- 47 and col. 4, lines 55-58). JP teaches latex coating on the color coated resin particles in example 1.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to utilize an elastomeric latex coating taught by Morrison or Miller et al in Jakubisin et al or Greenberg et al in order to provide color protective coating since the use of an elastomeric latex coating over various substrates in order to protect said substrates is well known in the art and since a latex coating on the color coated resin particles is also well known in the art.

Claims 1-10, 13-19, 21-28 and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jakubisin et al (US 5,543,172) or Greenberg et al (US 5,910,514) in view of Morrison (US 4,745,032), Miller et al (US 5,369,146) and further in view of JP 62131050 and Friel et al (US 6,689,824).

The instant invention further recites the use of and opacifying pigment and extender. However, colored coating compositions comprising said opacifying pigment and extender are well known in the art as taught by Friel et al (examples and claim 1).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to further utilize colored coating compositions comprising an opacifying pigment and an

Art Unit: 1714

extender in Jakubisin et al or Greenberg et al thereof since the use of such colored coating is a routine practice in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae H Yoon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1128. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tae H Yoon Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714

THY/March 11, 2004